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Pratesa Debulaela

ABSTRACT

This study aimed to investigate the students’ attitude toward peer feedback. The data were collected through questionnaire that was distributed to 20 students of Micro Teaching classes as the participants. The researcher analyzed peer feedback from two different aspects: as peer feedback receivers and as peer feedback givers. The result of this study shows that on average 58.75% of the participants had positive attitudes as PF receivers, though 41.25% of them disagreed with the fact. It was also found that 51.88% of the participants were reported to have positive attitudes as PF givers, while 48.12% denied it. On average, 55.32% of the participants had positive attitudes, while 44.68% of the participants were reported to have negative or neutral attitudes toward peer feedback.
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INTRODUCTION

How do we know that our work is good or not? We usually rely on feedback given by other people. Hyland & Hyland (2006a) define feedback as the kind of comments, suggestions or criticism for some components in someone’s work, as it is believed to be the media to stimulate learning. In learning we need data to be processed, and then we will produce an output as a result of learning. The process of learning is actually not finished there. The outputs sometimes still need to be revised. Here, feedback is seen as a new input that will be reprocessed to produce a better output. Feedback is considered as one of the keys to successful learning (Brown, 1994, in Alavi & Kaivanpanah, 2007). Feedback also plays an important role in motivating further learning.
as it informs learners about the degree of their learning or their needs for improvement (ibid).

Feedback can come from many sources. It may come externally (teacher feedback & peer feedback) and internally (monitoring their own behavior) (ibid). Peer feedback will be the topic for this research because it is often seen as an unimportant comment toward students’ work. This perception needs to be dug out deeper in order to inform to the teacher which feedback is the most suitable for improving students’ work. Topping et al (2000) in Van der Pol, Van den Berg, Admiraal, & Simons (2007) define peer feedback as an academic management where students are free to comment on the quality of their peers’ writing work. Another definition points out that peer feedback is a way to engage students to reflect on their friends’ work and then supply feedback to them (Falchikov, 1986, in Van der Pol et al, 2007).

Compared to teacher feedback, many researchers (Hedgcock and Lefkowitz, 1992 in Kamimura, 2006; Paulus, 1999) believe that peer feedback gives more benefits for the learners’ work. Hoa (2009) mentions speaking competence, communicating skills and critical thinking skills are among the skills students can sharpen when joining a peer feedback session. Speaking competence can be improved through giving feedback when the feedback given is in a form of oral feedback. However, it does not cover the possibility for improving speaking competence in written feedback. When there is a discussion session after giving written feedback, the speaking competence may also occur. In terms of relationship, Villamil and de Guerrero (2006) state each student takes advantage of their relationship since peer feedback will invite students sharing and
exchanging comment. It also can increase the knowledge for both who give feedback and those who are being assessed because through exchanging comment, they will share the correction.

Besides those advantages, there is also a major issue related to culture that takes place to the value of peer feedback. In Indonesia, the reluctant feeling still exists in many activities. The same thing is also true when students have to give feedback to their peer’s performance. According to Tang and Tithecott (1999) in Nelson and Carson (2006), Asian students tend to worry that their comments may criticize other’s work. It makes students unable to share their opinion toward peer’s work. The feeling of reluctance and worries delimitate their true opinion in giving comments about their peer’s work. This statement is not completely true when we rely on students’ interaction. Guerrero & Villamil (1996) in Hyland & Hyland (2006b), argue that in fact students can give feedback, even 80 percent of it is considered collaborative, without any intentions of hurting each other’s feeling. This statement can support the benefits for work improvement. By receiving feedback from their peer, learner will be more comfortable in revising the work.

Even though there are many beliefs about the advantages of peer feedback, we should also pay attention on the reliability of the feedback. Can peer feedback be trusted to improve students’ quality of work if their peer has lower competence? Students who have low competency may give feedback for their peer without serious concern. Leki (1990) in Kamimura (2006) pointed out this potential problem appeared due to the students’ lack of experience in peer feedback. They sometimes simply give comments out
of the context such as the appearance of the performance, the gesture, the little mispronunciation, etc. They rarely pay attention to the content which can improve their peer’s work. If it happens, peer feedback may not be useful.

From the previous explanation about the reliability, students known to believe that peer feedback is not important. They have a distrust feeling when they receive feedback from their peer. Zhang (1995) in Hyland and Hyland (2006b) supported the statement and found that teachers were more experienced in improving grammatical errors than peers. Zhang’s (ibid) finding shows that his respondents preferred teacher feedback due to the lack of their peer’s expertise. Expecting feedback from peers is ineffective, since the peer is considered less competent compared to the teacher (Saito & Fujita, 2004 in Yanga, Badgerb & Yuc, 2006). Those statements are not always true when peer who gives feedback is more capable than those who are being assessed. The ‘smarter’ students may be able to give feedback on grammatical error as reliable as the teacher’s feedback.

Although there had been a lot of research on peer feedback such as Hoa (2009) who concerned on the effectiveness of PF and Lee (2010) who differentiate kinds of PF, to my best knowledge little is known about peer feedback in the Indonesian context. For example, do English teachers in Indonesia consider peer feedback useful and helpful? In what way peer feedback can improve the teaching and learning English? Is peer feedback viewed positively or negatively by the students? Therefore, I believe it is still necessary to do some additional research on this area. In order to provide deeper understanding of peer feedback in their class, I would like to address the following research question: “What is the students’ attitude toward peer feedback in Micro Teaching class?” The
students’ attitude would be seen from two different aspects: as peer feedback receiver and as peer feedback giver. The purpose of this differentiation was to make the discussion could be delivered more specifically.

By knowing the students’ attitude toward peer feedback in Micro Teaching class, it is hoped that the teachers will be able to decide whether it is useful and helpful in assist the students in learning process. If students’ attitude was found to be positive, teacher may continue to apply peer feedback in their class. However, if students have negative attitudes toward peer feedback, teacher may change peer feedback into another kind of assessment. The most important thing is that teachers also have to look up on the students’ feeling, whether or not they have interest on peer feedback. That’s why the affective aspect is important to be included in the discussion because students’ feeling support their opinion toward something, in this case was peer feedback. In addition, the results of this study might be useful for the students to gain the advantages of peer feedback maximally.

THE STUDY

Context

This study was conducted in Micro Teaching classes in the Faculty of Language and Literature (FLL) of Satya Wacana Christian University (SWCU), Salatiga, Central Java. Micro Teaching class creates a safe venue where beginning student-teachers can develop, practice, and craft their teaching skills and professional identities as English teachers. The course will be set in a way so that each student-teacher can teach their peers
3 times. The mini lessons should be perceived as a learning experience of designing lesson plans, developing materials and teaching techniques for 15-20 minute-lesson. The mini lesson is followed up by the whole-class reflection so that student-teachers can achieve feedback from each other as well as from the instructor of the course. At the end of the course, students are expected to develop a situated understanding of what a good teacher and a good teaching in a post method era.

**Participants**

The participants of the research were 20 students of the FLL, SWCU, Indonesia, who took Micro Teaching class opened in semester II 2011/2012. There were 4 males and 16 females. They were all Indonesians and their age ranged from 21 to 22 years old. By the time this research was being conducted, they had studied English for about 11 years.

**Data Collection**

I used a questionnaire to collect data (see Appendix A). The questionnaire was developed based on the theory about peer feedback that had been explained in the introduction. The questionnaire was made in Bahasa Indonesia to avoid misinterpretation. There were 16 questions which would be divided into two parts: as peer feedback receiver and as peer feedback giver.

Part A (as peer feedback receiver) contained 8 questions. Five questions asked students’ opinions toward peer feedback (cognitive aspects). The questions asked
whether they believed by receiving peer feedback they could get some benefits: 1) being motivated to be better, 2) knowing their needs for improvement, 3) increasing relationship with friends, 4) increasing their knowledge, and 5) sharpening their critical thinking. Three other questions asked students’ feeling toward peer feedback (affective aspects). The questions asked whether they 1) felt comfortable receiving peer feedback, 2) felt reluctant receiving peer feedback, and 3) preferred peer feedback than teacher feedback.

Part B (as peer feedback giver) also consisted of 8 questions. Five questions asked students’ opinions toward peer feedback (cognitive aspects). The questions asked whether they believed by giving peer feedback they could get some benefits: 1) knowing their needs for improvement, 2) increasing relationship with friends, 3) being motivated to be better, 4) sharpening their critical thinking, and 5) increasing their knowledge. Three other questions asked students’ feeling toward peer feedback (affective aspects). The questions asked whether: 1) they felt reluctant giving peer feedback, 2) they worried that their comment made their friends offended, and 3) it was difficult giving peer feedback.

In filling out the questionnaire, the participants had to choose the options ranged from Strongly Agree, Agree, Neutral, Disagree and Strongly Disagree for statements in the questionnaire. Besides putting a mark for agreeing or disagreeing statements, the participants were also asked to provide the reasons of their answers. By knowing the participants’ reasons for their answer, I hoped it help me to discover what attitude they felt when deal with peer feedback in Micro Teaching class.
After consulting the questionnaire to my supervisor and before its administration, I piloted the questionnaire to 10 students in a Micro Teaching class. First, I asked for permission from the lecture. Then I delivered the questionnaire at the end of the class. Based on this, I got ideas to revise several unclear statements that caused misinterpretation such as: *peer feedback made me being motivated* was not clear in term of as receiver or as giver. So, I changed the phrase into *receiving peer feedback made me being motivated* and *giving peer feedback made me being motivated*. I also had an idea to add more time for my participants to fill in the questionnaire from 10 minutes to 20 minutes. After I revised the questionnaire and got the permission from the lecturers, I delivered the questionnaire to two Micro Teaching classes.

**Data Analysis**

After the data had been collected, first I grouped all statements from the questionnaire into two parts: peer feedback receiver and peer feedback giver. Second, I also divided the first part (peer feedback receiver) into two sub-headings; cognitive aspects (students’ opinions) and affective aspects (students’ feeling). Third, I categorized students’ answer in each sub-heading as positive, negative, and neutral. The answers were considered as positive, if the students chose *strongly agree* and *agree*. The answers belonged to negative ones, if they chose *strongly disagree* and *disagree*. While the students’ answers were classified as neutral, if they chose *neutral*.

Fourth, I typed all the students’ reasons. Then I discussed why several attitudes were formed based on the students’ reasons. The students’ reasons were classified as
positive cognitive if it implies positive opinion. This could be shown by the appearance of positive opinion phrases such as *it helps me to be better, it increases my knowledge about teaching, I was motivated*, etc. The students’ reasons were considered as negative cognitive if it implies negative opinion. The phrases appeared on this type such as *it didn’t make me being motivated, and it had no correlation with friendship*. The students’ answer belonged to neutral cognitive if it was difficult to decide whether it implies positive or negative opinion. This shown by dual phrases such as *it increases my knowledge but depends on which friend who gives feedback, and it is useful but depends on the comment (made us motivated or not)*.

The students’ reason belonged to positive affective when it implies positive feeling. This was shown by positive phrases like *I felt comfortable receiving peer feedback, I didn’t felt hesitant with friends’ capability, I felt excited receiving peer feedback*, etc. Negative affective were indicated from students’ answer that implies negative feeling. This could be shown by the presence of negative phrases *I felt reluctant receiving peer feedback, I worried about friends’ comment*, etc. While the students’ answer were classified as neutral affective if it was difficult to decide whether it implies positive or negative feeling. This shown by neutral phrases containing words like “sometimes” or “but”, such as *teacher feedback was more objective but peer feedback more detail, sometimes I preferred teacher feedback because friends’ lack of capability*, etc.
Fifth, I discussed the students’ reasons with the related theories and previous research findings. Sixth, I repeated step 2 to 5 for the second part (peer feedback giver). Seventh, I drew conclusion from the whole findings.

**FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION**

To answer the research question “What is students’ attitude toward peer feedback in Micro Teaching class?”, the result of this study found that the participants had positive attitudes toward PF in Micro Teaching Class with the average percentage 55.32%. They believed that PF gave them motivation to be better, helped them know what to improve, increased their knowledge, or made them become more critical. On the other hand, 44.68% of the participants were reported to have negative or neutral attitudes toward PF. They pointed out that teacher feedback (TF) was better than PF, while the majority of them did not think that they felt comfortable receiving feedback from their own peers. Still others were also worried that their feedback would offend their peers, and thus they were reluctant to do it. The result of this study also shows that on average 58.75% of the participants had positive attitudes as PF receivers, though 41.25% of them disagreed with the fact. Similarly, viewed from PF givers, it was found that 51.88% of the participants were reported to have positive attitudes as PF givers, while 48.12% denied it. In short, the overall findings indicate that the participants were almost equally divided into two categories: those who had positive and those who had negative or neutral attitudes towards PF.
**Students’ attitudes as PF receivers**

Students’ attitudes as PF receivers were discussed from two different aspects: cognitive aspects and affective aspects. The first cognitive aspect asked if receiving PF would help the students know what to improve in their Micro Teaching class. The result from the questionnaire surprisingly shows that all of the participants (100.00%) agreed with the statement.

(1) “Comments from friends told us about what is good and bad in our teaching practice, we could use the comments to improve the good and fix the bad thing for the next teaching practice” (Student B)

(2) “It would be difficult to evaluate ourselves, we need comments from friends because they could judge our teaching performance from a different point of view” (Student O)

The second important finding on the cognitive aspect was related to the statement if receiving feedback from their peers would increase their knowledge. The data from the questionnaire indicate that 95.00% of the participants agreed with the statement, while only 5.00% of them gave an opposite answer. The third important finding on the cognitive aspect which also had high percentage dealt with the statement whether receiving feedback would motivate them to be better. It was found that 90.00% of the participants agreed, while 10.00% of them had a contradictory answer. Here, some of the students commented that receiving PF increased their knowledge and motivated them to teach better. Some others also believed that receiving PF was helpful for them.

(3) “There were so many suggestions from friends. It made me motivated to be better. Their comments also increase my knowledge on how to teach in a proper way” (Student A)

(4) “Sometimes friends would be rather reluctant to give critical comments, that’s why their comments usually also contained motivation, it really helps” (Student K)
Another important finding was that 85.00% of the participants agreed that receiving feedback would make them more critical in thinking. While only 15.00% of them disagreed.

(5) “The detailed comments from friends made me more critical in evaluating my teaching performance” (Student F)

Unlike the four findings above that showed high percentage of positive answers, statement 3 appeared to be the least beneficial of receiving PF. Only 40.00% of the participants agreed that receiving feedback would increase their friendship, while 60.00% of them had different opinions.

(6) “If friends criticize me, I felt enthusiastic to correct my mistake and be better in next teaching performance. Receiving PF also made me being more critical but it would not affect friendship at all” (Student S)

The findings of the current study were consistent with those of Hoa’s (2009) who found students could get some benefits from receiving PF such as sharpening the critical thinking skills and increasing students’ knowledge. Receiving PF could also enhance disciplinary understanding, critical thinking skills, give students more ownership over their work, and encourage active engagement with the course related (Sadler, 2010). Moreover, students believed that they could gain benefits from receiving PF. PF was not only made them know their needs for improvement but also increased their knowledge and motivated them to be better. Unfortunately, in term of friendship, this study was unable to demonstrate that students took advantages of their relationship since PF would invite them to share and exchange comments (Villamil and de Guerrero, 2006). It seems possible that these results occurred due to the absence of discussion process in Micro
Teaching class. Because sharing and exchanging comment might be useful in strengthening friendship among students were not found during the class.

Contrary to the high percentage results on cognitive aspects, the affective aspects of receiving PF had lower percentage. The first affective aspect asked if the students felt comfortable receiving PF, while the second dealt with the fact whether or not they were not reluctant receiving PF. From the questionnaire, the results of these two statements were the same. Only 10.00% of the participants felt comfortable and were not reluctant in receiving PF, while 90.00% of them had opposite answers.

(7) “I like the way they delivered the feedback, it was friendly and comforting. I could get many useful comments for my improvement” (Student C)

Those who felt uncomfortable and reluctant in receiving PF delivered two main reasons. First because it felt awkward being judged by peers. Some others commented they were unsure about their peers’ competence.

(8) “It was weird when friends criticized my performance. Moreover, some close friend gave unserious comments” (Student Q)

(9) “I felt reluctant receiving PF because I was not sure with friends’ ability in evaluating my teaching performance” (Student H)

The next important finding of affective aspect was related to preferences. The data showed that 40.00% of participants preferred receiving PF than TF. As a result, 60.00% of them preferred receiving TF.

(10) “I preferred TF than PF because I thought teacher knew the assessment standard better than friends” (Student R)

The low percentage of the affective aspects might be explained by the fact that many students were lack of understanding of PF criteria. They were not sure whether the PF givers judged their performance according to the assessment standard. These findings
supported the idea of Zhang (1995) in Hyland and Hyland (2006b) who said students preferred teachers’ feedback because they believed in teachers’ competence. Moreover, it confirmed findings from Saito and Fujita (2004) in Yanga, Badgerb, and Yuc (2006) which showed expecting PF was ineffective since the peer was considered less competent compared to the teacher.

Apparently, the majority of the students did not feel comfortable in receiving PF although they understood that they could gain many benefits in receiving PF such as motivating to be better, knowing their needs for improvement, and increasing knowledge. Fortunately, the low affective percentage was not affecting the attitude. Students still had high amount of beliefs that receiving PF gave them lot of benefits. These findings suggested that the lecturer of the Micro Teaching class should create more comfortable atmosphere in order to make the PF receiver welcome the comments from their peer. The students also had to be given clear understanding about the criteria of PF assessment. In addition, the lecturer could make a pattern to be used in the teaching evaluation form, such as; the good thing about your teaching performance was…, the things should be improved from your teaching was…, in the next mini teaching you may …, etc. Then at the end of the meeting the teacher could redeliver the conclusion of the whole comments to make the PF receiver more comfortable receiving their teaching evaluation.

Students’ attitude as PF givers

The students’ attitudes as PF givers were also discussed from two different aspects: cognitive aspects and affective aspects. The first cognitive aspect asked if giving
PF would make the students more critical in thinking. It was interesting to find that 100.00% of the participants agreed with this statement. It seemed possible that these results occurred due to their way of thinking when dealing as PF givers. Subconsciously, they became more critical because they had to think about how to provide valuable feedback for their friends.

(11) “By giving PF, I learned how to think beyond the ordinary comment. I tried to not only give monotonous comment. That’s made me more critical in thinking” (Student S)

The second finding on cognitive aspect shows that 95.00% students agreed that giving PF would increase their knowledge, while only 5.00% had dissenting voice. This finding corroborates the ideas of Villamil and de Guerrero (2006), who suggested that PF could increase knowledge both who gave feedback and those who were being assessed.

(12) “I thought about what comment I should gave for them, then I tried to apply it to myself. It made me think about my own teaching performance, and increased my knowledge” (Student N)

The third cognitive aspect asked whether giving PF would motivate the students to be better. The result was 85.00% of the participants agreed, while 15.00% had a contrary opinion. As mention by Student N above, she tried to apply the feedback for herself. In other words, she was motivated to be better in the next teaching performance.

The fourth finding in cognitive aspect dealt with friendship. From the questionnaire, it was found that only 30.00% of the students agreed that giving PF could increase their friendship, while 70.00% of them disagreed. The reasons were similar with the previous part: students’ attitude as PF receivers. As PF givers, students also agreed that PF had nothing to do with friendship.

(13) “We only conveyed our judgment for friends’ performance. I did not think it had correlation with friendship” (Student J)
The last finding in cognitive aspect had a surprising result. Only 10.00% of the participants agreed that giving PF would make them know what to improve, while 90.00% of them had opposite answers. This finding confirmed the statement in the previous part of discussion that students could not judge themselves. That is why giving PF could not make them realize what was good and bad on their own teaching performance.

(14) “I could not evaluate myself, so I did not think I could discover what my needs to improvement. However, I use my comment for friends to motivate myself to teach better in the next teaching performance” (Student M)

The present results seemed to be consistent with Leki’s finding (1990) in Kamimura (2006), he pointed out that PF givers might do the assessment without serious concern because their lack of experience. As a result, the PF givers could not gain benefits as much as when they acted as PF receivers.

It was interesting to note that the percentage of affective aspects as PF givers was also as low as PF receivers. The first cognitive aspect investigated whether students felt reluctant in giving PF. The data showed that only 35.00% of the participants were not reluctant giving PF, while as many as 65.00% of them had inverse answers. Their reluctance due to the low confidence compared to their own teaching performance. Besides, they felt hesitant to criticize their friends’ teaching performance.

(15) “I felt reluctant giving PF because I thought I wasn’t good enough in my mini teaching” (Student L)

(16) “I thought the one who should evaluate was teachers, not peers. So it would be weird if I should criticize friends’ performance” (Student Q)

There were similarities between the attitudes expressed by Student L and Student Q in this study and those described by Connor and Asenavage (1994) in Kamimura
(2006) who explained that one of the reasons for their students’ reluctance to give peer feedback was a lack of experience.

The second affective aspects as PF givers explored whether students worried the comments might offend their friend. From the data we concluded that only 40.00% of the participants were not worried about their friends’ reaction after receiving their comments, while 60.00% of them thought about their friends’ feeling. The reason was related to the previous aspects. The reluctant feeling leaded them to be worried about their friends’ emotion regarding feedback.

(17) “I was worried if my comments would make my friends down or something, because for some people being criticized means bad” (Students E)

The third affective aspect which dealt with difficulties still had low percentage. Only 20.00% of the participants though that giving PF was not difficult, while 80.00% of them had different opinions. These result might relate to two affective aspects above. Since the students worried that their comments might criticize others’ work (Tang and Tithecott, 1999, in Nelson and Carson, 2006), it made them unable to share their opinion toward peer’s performance.

(18) “I thought it was difficult to give an appropriate comment which would not make my friends like being criticized” (Student K)

In contrast Guerrero and Villamil (1996) in Hyland and Hyland (2006b) argued that actually students could give PF without intentions of hurting each other’s feeling. Moreover, Lee (2010) added that in fact PF contained more suggestion than criticism.

Overall, students had positive attitude as PF givers. It was somewhat surprising that the percentage of students’ positive responses from affective aspects was lower than
the cognitive aspects. It seemed that some students still felt reluctant to give PF although they understood the value behind the PF. These findings were in line with the study from Nelson and Carson (2006) which was said Asian students tended to keep the classroom environment harmony by not criticizing others’ work. In responses to these findings, the lecturer of Micro Teaching class could continue to use PF as one of the evaluation methods but with a little modification. The lecturer could add a discussion session at the end of meeting to conclude the whole comments from the PF givers. It was hoped the PF givers would not be reluctant to comment on their friends’ performance because the discussion season included the lecture as a mediator.

CONCLUSION

The present study was carried out to investigate students’ attitude toward PF in Micro Teaching class. The findings had shown that students had positive attitude both as PF receivers and PF givers. The second major finding was that the percentage of the affective aspects was always lower than the cognitive aspects. It indicated that although students were aware of benefits they could gain through PF process, they were quite uncomfortable with this kind of assessment. The PF receivers felt hesitant about peer’s competence, while the PF givers felt reluctant to assess their friends’ performance. However, the results highlighted the fact that the students could achieve useful advantages through receiving and giving PF. Knowing their needs for improvement and increasing knowledge appeared to be the most beneficial of receiving PF. At the same
time, the most beneficial of giving PF were making more critical in thinking and increasing knowledge.

The results of this study suggested that the lecturer of Micro Teaching class should continue to use PF as one of essential assessments. In regard to the findings that the willingness of receiving and giving PF were still low, the lecturer could modify either the evaluation form or the method of PF practice. It is recommended that further research be undertaken in the following areas: which method was effective to manage PF session? With or without evaluation form? Oral or written?

The results might not be applicable to other context because it was limited to the students of Micro Teaching class of FLL, SWCU. Nonetheless, hopefully the findings of the study could give some insight to the teachers who want to apply PF in their classroom. Teacher could conduct PF session and still considering the students’ affective aspects.
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Appendix

A survey on Peer Feedback in Micro Teaching Class

Questionnaire ini diperlukan untuk melengkapi data thesis tentang peer feedback di kelas micro teaching. Identitas Anda sebagai subject penelitian akan dirahasiakan, serta jawaban yang Anda berikan tidak akan saya salah gunakan. Jawablah questionnaire di bawah ini dengan jujur. Tidak ada jawaban benar atau salah, dan jawaban tidak akan mempengaruhi nilai. Terima kasih atas kerjasamanya 😊

Nama : ___________________________ (pria / wanita)
NIM : ___________________________

Saya sudah belajar Bahasa Inggris selama . . . . tahun.

Berilah tanda ( X ) pada pernyataan di bawah ini. Tulis juga alasan di tempat yang disediakan.

Part A (Sebagai Penerima Peer Feedback)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sangat setuju</th>
<th>Setuju</th>
<th>Netral</th>
<th>Tidak setuju</th>
<th>Sangat tidak setuju</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Menerima peer feedback meningkatkan hubungan pertemanan saya.

4. Menerima peer feedback dapat meningkatkan pengetahuan saya.

5. Menerima peer feedback dapat membuat saya lebih kritis dalam berpikir.

**Alasan:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alasan</th>
<th>Sangat setuju</th>
<th>Setuju</th>
<th>Netral</th>
<th>Tidak setuju</th>
<th>Sangat tidak setuju</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. Saya merasa nyaman menerima peer feedback.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Saya tidak enggan menerima feedback dari teman.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Saya lebih menyukai menerima peer feedback daripada teacher feedback.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Alasan:**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sangat setuju</th>
<th>Setuju</th>
<th>Netral</th>
<th>Tidak setuju</th>
<th>Sangat tidak setuju</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Memberi peer feedback membantu saya mengetahui hal yang harus diperbaiki (dalam mengajar).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Memberi peer feedback meningkatkan hubungan pertemanan saya.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Memberi peer feedback dapat memotivasi saya untuk menjadi lebih baik.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Memberi peer feedback dapat membuat saya lebih kritis dalam berpikir.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Alasan:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sangat setuju</th>
<th>Setuju</th>
<th>Netral</th>
<th>Tidak setuju</th>
<th>Sangat tidak setuju</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Saya tidak sungkan untuk memberi peer feedback.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>15.</strong> Saya tidak khawatir komentar yang saya berikan pada teman akan membuatnya tersinggung</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>16.</strong> Saya tidak merasa kesulitan dalam memberikan peer feedback.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Alasan:*

😊 Thank You 😊